

RESOURCE ACTIVITIES HAVE OUTGROWN PRESENT ORGANIZATION

My advocacy of a Department of Natural Resources does not constitute severe criticism of the performance of existing departments, although it is often interpreted as doing so. Given their limitations and their overlapping of responsibility, our agencies have done a commendable job. But our needs in resource development and conservation have simply outrun our agency structure.

For example, a century ago, water management meant the construction of dams, pipelines, and sewer systems. Later, it included treating municipal water supplies to kill disease germs. Meanwhile, rivers were improved for navigation, and dams constructed for electric power production. Subsequently, there came the building of flood control works. For the future, water management must mean the conservation of all uses, preservation of water and related land resources, and provision of enough water for constantly expanding needs.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING COULD RESULT FROM REORGANIZATION

Were I asked to list concrete beneficial effects that might be expected from the creation of a Department of Natural Resources, I would put first the opportunity to improve long-range planning.

There exists nowhere a comprehensive plan that states our resource requirements and delineates a program for meeting them.

A first priority of the Department of Natural Resources should be the preparation of such a plan. The plan should set forth the national goals, projected alternative programs for reaching those goals, and the costs involved.

This will furnish to the President and the Congress, the facts upon which wise decisions can be made.

This, in general, is the method utilized so successfully by great industrial enterprises. It combines maximum efficiency with maximum flexibility.

STRICT DEPARTMENT COULD IMPROVE INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
should be done," the problem of water supply was "first of all, a great responsibility of our local governments."